

The date of publication of M. Spinola's paper on the Hymenoptera collected by V. Ghiliani in Para, with notes on the Eumenidae described in this work

by

J. VAN DER VECHT

Burg. Vermeerlaan 4, Putten, Netherlands

Although the volume of the memoirs of the Academy of Sciences of Turin, which contains the above mentioned paper by Spinola (series II, vol. XIII) was published in 1853, some authors have given 1851 as the date of publication of that paper. One finds the latter date, for example, in the "Catalogus Hymenopterorum" of Dalla Torre (1892—1902), in his review of the Vespidae in the "Genera Insectorum" (1904), and in Zavattari's paper on the South American Eumenidae (1912). Recent authors, for example Richards (1934), Bohart & Stange (1965), Townes (1966) and Willink (1972), appear to have generally agreed with Bequaert (1912) who wrote: "Zavattari, il est vrai, donne l'année 1851 comme date de publication de l'espèce de Spinola, mais par erreur, je pense. L'exemplaire des Mémoires de l'Académie de Turin, contenant la description d'*O. azurescens*, que j'ai pu consulter, ne porte pas d'autre date que 1853; c'est d'ailleurs la date donnée par Hagen pour le travail de Spinola, tant pour sa publication dans les Mémoires de Turin que pour les tirages à part. Voir aussi à ce sujet la remarque de Saussure, *Smithson Miscell. Coll.*, no. 254, 1875, p. 121."

The latter author writes there concerning a species described in Spinola's paper: "The name *M. infernalis* was given by my excellent friend Marquis Max. Spinola before I gave the species the name of *Spinolae*, but the manuscript of Spinola having taken a long time to print, the name *Spinolae* was published first, so that I was obliged to preserve it."

Nearly twenty years ago I came across a separate of Spinola's paper in the library of the "Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie", Leiden, which differs in pagination from the same article in the bound volume of the journal (3—78 and 19—94, respectively). The fact that according to the title page this separate was published in 1851, aroused serious doubts whether Bequaert's conclusion was correct. At that time there was no special inducement to go further into the matter, but recently the question forced itself on me in connection with the preparation of a catalogue of the neotropical Eumenidae. Very probably the exact date of Spinola's paper will prove to be of little importance for the majority of the species described in this work, but in the Eumenidae some nomenclatorial problems arise from the publication of de Saussure's monograph of this family in the years 1852 and 1853.

That it must have been practically possible to issue separates of the paper in 1851 is demonstrated by the following facts. The manuscript was submitted for publication in the session of 15 December 1850, as is evident from the title page in volume XIII of the "Memorie". The preceding volume of this journal contains a report on the activities of the Academy in the years 1849 and 1850, in which the "Segretario Aggiunto" states that the paper by Spinola was already printed in "Volume XIII, pag. 19". Since this report bears the date 22 February 1852, it was probably written in 1851.

When I consulted Prof. O. W. Richards on this subject, he wrote me (June 1974) that he knew of the existence of two versions of Spinola's paper, but that he was uncertain whether the separate really appeared in 1851. He noted that Carus & Engelmann (1861) as well as Hagen (1863) give 1853 as the date of the journal and for the reprint or separate.

It is now possible to prove, however, that the version with the separate pagination appeared indeed in 1851 or, at the latest, early in 1852. The clue is the following note in de Saussure's monograph (1852 : 22); it is inserted as an "Appendice" to the discussion of the genus *Zethus*: "Pendant que ces pages s'imprimaient, j'ai eu connaissance du mémoire de M. Spinola, intitulé: *Compte-rendu des Hyménoptères*

inédits provenant du voy. entom. de M. Ghiliani, etc. (Mém. Acad. de Turin. Serie II, tom. XIII), dans lequel il décrit un insecte qui doit rentrer dans le genre *Zethus*, sans qu'il nous soit possible de dire s'il appartient à la deuxième ou à la troisième division. — *Zethus geniculatus* (*Didymogastra geniculata* Spinol. p. 64). Long 13 mill. Niger," etc.

From this "Appendice" two important conclusions can be drawn.

(1) Since the first part of de Saussure's monograph, containing the pages 1—128 (and the plates 2—5) was received by the British Museum on 11 Nov. 1852 (see Griffin, 1939), it is evident that the copy of Spinola's paper, mentioned by de Saussure, must have appeared some time, probably several months, before that date.

(2) This copy must have belonged to the issue dated 1851, for only in this version is *Didymogastra geniculata* discussed on p. 64.

Consequently the version of 1851 may safely be regarded as a preprint,¹⁾ which preceded the publication of de Saussure's monograph. Although this author in a later work (Saussure, 1875) appears not to have regarded the preprint as a valid publication (see below under *Odynerus? azurescens*), there seem to be no valid reasons to reject it now, for it evidently satisfies the provisions of the Code of Zoological Nomenclature. Consequently 1851 is to be taken as the date of first publication of all new taxa described in this work.

The effect of this conclusion on the nomenclature of some South American Eumenidae is incorporated in the following annotated list of all the species of this family described or discussed in Spinola's paper.

Didymogastra geniculata Spinola, 1851, Mém. Acad. Sci. Turin (2) 13 (preprint): 64, no. 60, ♀ ♂ - Placed in the synonymy of *Zethus* (*Zethoides*) *binodis* (Fabr. 1798) by Bohart and Stange (1965: 155), who incorrectly give 1793 as the date of publication of *Z. binodis*; they refer to Spinola, 1853: 60, evidently citing the number of the species instead of that of the page (80 in the journal).

Eumenes ghiliani Spinola, 1851, l.c.: 65, no. 61, ♂ - Apparently not recognized by subsequent authors. De Saussure (1855: 140) noted that he did not know the species and reproduced the original description; Zavattari (1912) did not mention the species. My impression that this would prove to be a species of *Pachymenes* which I had found to be common in Surinam was confirmed by a recent visit to the Zoological Museum of the University of Torino (Sept. 1974), where I was kindly allowed to study the Spinola collection. A male placed here together with a female of "*brunnea* M.B." is evidently the type of *Eumenes ghiliani* Spinola. It is identical with *Pachymenes pallipes* Saussure, 1852 (nec *Vespa pallipes* Olivier cited by de Saussure as a questionable synonym), which name now goes into synonymy.

Eumenes brunnea Spinola, 1851, l.c.: 66, ♀. - In a paragraph following the description of the preceding species Spinola discusses a female from Brazil which he received under the name of *Eumenes brunnea* M. B. (Mus. Berlin) from Klug. Since this name had not been published previously and because Spinola states that the female closely resembles the male of *E. ghiliani*, but has the clypeus entirely black, *E. brunnea* Spinola, 1851, must be regarded as an available name. It was not recognized as such by Dalla Torre (1894) or by later authors.

Examination of the type has now shown that *E. brunnea* is only a colour form of *E. ghiliani*, as already suspected by Spinola. He wrote: "Les *Eumenes brunnea* et *ghiliani* ne seraient donc des variétés de la même espèce? Dans ce cas, par un juste égard à la communication du Doct. Berlinois, je désirerais conserver à cette espèce, quand même elle serait encore inédite, le nom sous lequel il a été le premier à signaler l'existence."

¹⁾ The library of the U.S. Department of Agriculture at Beltsville possesses a copy which bears the date 1851 and was given by Saussure to H. Milne Edwards as evidenced by this author's handwriting on the green cover (information received from Mr. Arnold Menke, U.S. National Museum).

I do not think that this wish which would revive a hitherto overlooked name and give it priority over one based on a fairly extensive description, could be supported by any of the provisions of the Code. Acting as first reviser in accordance with Article 24, I propose therefore to give *E. ghilianii* priority over *E. brunnea*.

Odynerus? azurescens Spinola, 1851, l.c.: 66, no. 62, ♀. - It is of interest to note that de Saussure (1855: 160) placed his *Montezumia rufipes* (1852: 89) in the synonymy of this species which was transferred to the genus *Montezumia*, and that he referred to the preprint of Spinola's paper ("p. 66, no. 62"). Later (Saussure, 1875: 117) he no longer recognized the priority of Spinola's name, and placed *M. rubritarsis* Sauss. (1852), *M. rufipes* Sauss. (1852) and *Odynerus azurescens* Spinola now cited as "Mém. Acad. Turin, XIII, 1853, 82, 62 ♂") all in the synonymy of *Montezumia coerulea* Saussure, 1852. Zavattari (1912) correctly gave the name *azurescens* priority over the four names under which de Saussure had described this species in 1852, but Bequaert (1921) selected *M. rufidentata* Sauss. (1852) as the valid name. Willink (1972) who also regarded 1853 as the date of publication of Spinola's paper, followed this example. However, *M. azurescens* Spinola (1851) must now again be accepted as the correct name of this species.

Odynerus? carinulatus Spinola, 1851, l.c.: 67, no. 63, ♀. - This species was placed by de Saussure (1855: 166) in a new division *Parazumia* of the genus *Montezumia*. Bequaert (1921) regarded *Parazumia* as a synonym of *Pachymenes*, apparently unaware of a paper by Bertoni (1918) who treated *Parazumia* as a separate genus. According to Willink (in litt.) it is indeed preferable to give *Parazumia* generic rank.

Eumenes sepulchralis Spinola, 1851, l.c.: 67 [nomen nudum]. - Probably the specimen discussed under the description of *Od. carinulatus*, a wasp received from Klug with the unpublished name *Eumenes sepulchralis* M. Ber. (Mus. Berlin), is the same as the type of *Montezumia sepulchralis* Saussure, described in 1855 from the collection of Spinola. Since Spinola says no more about this specimen than that the [gastral] petiole is as short as in "nos espèces de Para", the name *sepulchralis* is here only a "nomen nudum".

Odynerus infernalis Spinola, 1851, l.c.: 68, no. 64, ♂. - In 1875, when de Saussure had either overlooked the preprint of Spinola's work or regarded it as an invalid publication, he synonymized this species with his *Montezumia spinolae*, published in 1852, and gave the latter name priority. Bequaert (1921) followed this example, but in a paper which he published together with Salt in 1929 the species is recorded as *M. infernalis* (Spinola), the name which is also used by Zavattari (1912). This must now indeed be regarded as the correct name.

Odynerus indutus Spinola, 1851, l.c.: 69, ♀. - In the discussion which follows the description of *Od. infernalis*, Spinola mentions some characters of a female from Brazil sent to him by Klug under the previously unpublished name *Odynerus indutus* Kl. M. Ber. (Mus. Berlin). This name is not mentioned by de Saussure (1852—'55, 1875) nor by Dalla Torre (1894), but it occurs in a list of synonyms of *Montezumia brunnea* (Saussure) [recte: *brunea*] in Zavattari (1912) as "*Odynerus indutus* Klug in schedis, Spinola, Mem. Accad. Sc. Torino (2), XIII, 1851, p. 84, p. 85". As elsewhere in his paper, Zavattari gives the date of the preprint, but appears to have corrected the page numbers; if the name is regarded as available — and I think this is acceptable — Spinola should be cited as its author, for Klug cannot be held responsible for the conditions that made the name available (art. 50 of the Code). According to Willink (1972: 70) the type of *Odynerus "indutus" Klug* (♀) is identical with *Montezumia nigriceps* (Spinola), 1841, and its name is therefore invalid as a junior synonym.

Acknowledgements. — I am indebted to Mr. C. van Dijk, librarian of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, for providing bibliographic information, and to Mr. Arnold Menke and Professor O. W. Richards for comments on the manuscript.

SUMMARY

It can be proved that the paper of M. Spinola on the Hymenoptera collected by Ghiliani in Pará in "Memorie Accad. Sci. Torino" (2) 13: 19—94 (1853) was preceded by its publication in 1851, or at the latest early in 1852, as an "Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences de Turin" (2) 13: 3—78, dated 1851. Changes in nomenclature of Eumenidae resulting from this fact are: *Montezumia azurescens* (Spin.) 1851 = *M. rufidentata* Sauss. 1852; *Montezumia infernalis* (Spin.) 1851 = *M. spinolae* Sauss. 1852. *Eumenes ghiliani* Spinola 1851 is transferred to *Pachymenes* Sauss., with *Eumenes brunnea* Spinola 1851 and *Pachymenes pallipes* Saussure 1852 as synonyms.

LITERATURE

- Bequaert, J., 1921. Description d'une espèce Congolaise du genre "Montezumia" suivie de remarques taxonomiques sur ce groupe. *Revue zool. afr.* 9: 235—251.
- Bertoni, A. de Winkelried, 1918. Contribución al conocimiento de los Himenópteros Dípteros Americanos (Especies y nidos menos o poco conocidos). *An. cient. parag.* 2 (3): 184—202.
- Bohart, R. M. and L. A. Stange, 1965. A revision of the genus *Zethus* Fabricius in the western hemisphere (Hym.: Eumenidae). *Univ. Calif. Publ. Ent.* 40: 1—208.
- Carus, J. V. & W. Engelmann, 1861. *Bibliotheca Zoologica* II, Leipzig.
- Dalla Torre, K. W. von, 1892—1902. *Catalogus Hymenopterorum*, 10 vols.
- , 1904. Hymenoptera, Fam. Vespidae. *Genera Insectorum*, fasc. 19. — Wytsman, Bruxelles.
- Griffin, F. J., 1939. On the dates of publication of Saussure (H. de): Études sur la famille des Vespides 1—3, 1852—1858. *J. Soc. Bibl. Nat. Hist.* 1: 211—212.
- Hagen, H. A., 1863. *Bibliotheca entomologica* II, Leipzig.
- Richards, O. W., 1934. The American species of the genus *Trypoxylon*. *Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* 82: 173—362 (p. 281: *T. rufimanum* Spinola, 1853).
- Salt, G., & J. Bequaert, 1929. Stylopized Vespidae. *Psyche* 36: 249—282.
- Saussure, H. de, 1852—'53. Études sur la famille des Vespides. 1. Monographie des Guêpes solitaires, ou de la tribu des Euméniens, etc. — Paris, 6 + 50 + 286 pp., 22 pls.
- , 1854—'56. Études sur la famille des Vespides 3. Monographie des Masariens et un Supplément à la monographie des Euméniens. — Paris, Genève, 12 + 352 pp., 16 pls.
- , 1875. Synopsis of American wasps. *Smithson. misc. Collns* 254, 35 + 392 p., 4 pls.
- Spinola, M., 1851. Compte Rendu des Hyménoptères inédits provenant du voyage entomologique de M. Ghiliani dans le Para en 1846. Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences de Turin (2) 13: 3—78.
- , 1853. [Same article]. *Memorie Accad. Sci. Torino* (2) 13: 19—94.
- Townes, H. & M., 1966. A catalogue and reclassification of the Neotropic Ichneumonidae. *Mem. Amer. ent. Inst.* 8: 1—367.
- Willink, A., 1972. Synonymical notes concerning some Eumenid wasps. *Proc. K. ned. Akad. Wet. Ser. C* 75: 67—72.
- Zavattari, E., 1912. Materialien für eine Monographie der Neotropischen Eumeniden. *Arch. Naturgesch.* 78A 4: 1—272, 2 pls.